arXiv:1610.00885v1 [math.FA] 4 Oct 2016

Revisiting the Hahn–Banach Theorem and Nonlinear Infinite Programming

P. Montiel López[(a)] and M. Ruiz Galán[(b)]

October 5, 2016

[(a)]University of Granada, Centro de Estudios Superiores La Inmaculada,
Department of Sciences, c/ Joaquina Eguaras, 114, 18013 Granada (Spain),
e-mail: pablomontiel@eulainmaculada.com

[(b)]University of Granada, E.T.S. Ingeniería de Edificación,
Department of Applied Mathematics, c/ Severo Ochoa s/n, 18071 Granada (Spain),
e-mail: mruizg@ugr.es

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to state a sharp version of the König supremum theorem, an equivalent reformulation of the Hahn–Banach theorem. We apply it to derive statements of the Lagrange multipliers, Karush–Kuhn–Tucker and Fritz John type, for nonlinear infinite programs. We also show that a weak concept of convexity coming from minimax theory, infsup-convexity, is the adequate one for this kind of results.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 90C30, 46A22, 90C46, 26B25.

Key words: Hahn–Banach theorem, nonlinear programming, infinite programs, Lagrange multipliers, Karush–Kuhn–Tucker theorem, Fritz John theorem, infsup-convexity.

1 Introduction

Without a doubt, the Hahn–Banach theorem is not only a central result in functional and convex analysis, but also provides endless applications in many several fields, even outside of mathematics. One of its more powerful equivalent reformulations is the so-called *Mazur–Orlicz* theorem (see [20, Théorème 2.41], [22, Theorem, p. 365] and [17, Satz, p. 482], [29, Theorem 28], and its generalizations [17, Satz, p. 482 and Zusatz, p.483], [15, Theorem 1.1], [28, Theorem 2.9], [19, Theorem 2], [8, Theorem 12], [3, Theorem 3.1]), [31, Theorem 3.5] and [27, Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 6.1]), which allows one to find a linear functional dominated by another sublinear functional, and states in addition a control of the infimum of both functionals on a given convex set. Such a control is not trivial, and generates numerous applications in

functional analysis, minimax theory, variational analysis, monotone multifunctions theory or optimization, to name a few, as one can check, for instance, in [28, 19, 7, 3]. Along these same lines one can consider the *König supremum theorem* ([16, Erweiterter Maximumssatz p. 501]), which is an extension result in a space of bounded functions, although it is again equivalent to the Hahn–Banach theorem (the details can be found in Proposition 2.3).

The main result in this paper, Theorem 3.1, establishes as a consequence of the Mazur–Orlicz theorem, a generalization of the König supremum theorem that is optimal, in terms of a not very restrictive kind of convexity (*infsup-convexity*, see Definition 2.4 below). This notion of convexity arises in minimax theory: see [30, Definition 2.11], [14, p. 653] and [26, Definition 2.1]. In this setting, infsup-convexity is the adequate type of convexity to state some general characterizations of the minimax inequality ([25, Corollary 3.12]). Finally, from such a generalization we deduce several theorems for nonlinear infinite programs –Lagrange multipliers, Karush–Kuhn–Tucker, Fritz John– that are sharp, extending those in the finite case in [24, 21].

2 Preliminaries

Let us begin by evoking the Mazur–Orlicz theorem. Recall that a real-valued functional on a real linear space is *sublinear* if it is subadditive and positively homogeneous.

Theorem 2.1 (Mazur–Orlicz) *Suppose that E is a real vector space, C is a nonempty and convex subset of E, and that $S : E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a sublinear functional. Then, there exists a linear functional $L : E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$x \in E \;\Rightarrow\; L(x) \leq S(x)$$

and

$$\inf_{x \in C} L(x) = \inf_{x \in C} S(x).$$

Infinite values are allowed in the equality.

Let us also mention the König supremum theorem, which we will generalize in Section 3. To this end, if Λ is a nonempty set, Δ_Λ stands for the subset of the topological dual $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*$ of the real Banach space $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ (usual sup-norm) of all the bounded real-valued functions defined on Λ

$$\Delta_\Lambda := \{\Phi \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^* : \; \Phi \leq \sup_\Lambda\},$$

that is, $\Phi \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*$ belonging to Δ_Λ means that

$$\varphi \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda) \;\Rightarrow\; \Phi(\varphi) \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \varphi(\lambda).$$

It is very easy to prove that $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ if, and only if, Φ is positive, i.e., $\varphi \geq 0$ on Λ implies $\Phi(\varphi) \geq 0$, and $\Phi(\mathbf{1}) = 1$, where $\mathbf{1} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ is the constant function 1. In particular, when Λ is a nonempty finite set, $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ is of the form $\mathbb{R}^N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and Δ_Λ is the probability simplex

$$\Delta_N := \{(t_1, \ldots, t_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N : \ t_1, \ldots, t_N \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{N} t_j = 1\}.$$

As we will check in the proof of Proposition 2.3, the elements in Δ_Λ act as extension functionals.

Specifically, the König supremum theorem reads as follows:

Theorem 2.2 (König) *Let E be a real linear space, Λ be a nonempty set, $L : E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a linear functional and assume that, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $S_\lambda : E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a sublinear functional in such a way that*

$$x \in E \ \Rightarrow \ (S_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$$

and

$$x \in E \ \Rightarrow \ L(x) \leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} S_\lambda(x).$$

Then, there exists $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ satisfying

$$x \in E \ \Rightarrow \ L(x) \leq \Phi((S_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}).$$

Even in the finite case, this result implies a wide variety of applications: see [16, 15, 21].

Before stating a generelization of the preceding result, which will turn out to be sharp in terms of the functions under consideration, let us observe that not only is it a consequence of the Hahn–Banach theorem (see the proof of König in [16, Erweiterter Maximumssatz p. 501] from a variant of the Mazur–Orlicz theorem), but also an equivalent reformulation. Now we exactly prove that the validity of Theorem 2.2 implies (and therefore is equivalent to) that of the norm preserving extension version of the Hahn–Banach theorem.

Proposition 2.3 *The König supremum theorem implies the Hahn–Banach theorem.*

Proof. Suppose that E is a real normed space, F is a vector subspace of E, and that $y_0^* : F \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous and linear functional. We are going to find a continuous and linear functional $x_0^* : E \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$x_{0|F}^* = y_0^*$$

and

$$\|x_0^*\| = \|y_0^*\|$$

(usual dual norms). Assume that $\|y_0^*\| = 1$; then it suffices to consider the linear space F, the linear functional y_0^*, the index set

$$\Lambda := B_{E^*},$$

and, for all $(x^*, y) \in \Lambda \times F$,

$$S_{x^*}(y) := x^*(y),$$

which clearly satisfy the assumptions in König's supremum theorem. Then, there exists $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ such that

$$y \in F \;\Rightarrow\; y_0^*(y) \leq \Phi((x^*(y))_{x^* \in \Lambda}). \tag{2.1}$$

Now we can construct the required $x_0^* \in E^*$. Let $\rho : E \longrightarrow \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ be the linear operator assigning to each $x \in E$ the function $\rho(x) : \Lambda \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given for all $x^* \in \Lambda$ by

$$\rho(x)(x^*) := x^*(x).$$

It is clear that ρ is well defined and moreover is an linear isomorphism from E into $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)$. Then we can define x_0^* at each $x \in E$ as

$$x_0^*(x) := \Phi(\rho(x)).$$

This functional is obviously linear and in addition is continuous, since given $x \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_0^*(x) &= \Phi(\rho(x)) \\ &\leq \sup_{x^* \in \Lambda} \rho(x)(x^*), \qquad (\text{since } \Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda) \\ &\leq \|x\|, \end{aligned}$$

and thus, in particular,

$$\|x_0^*\| \leq 1.$$

In view of this inequality, it only remains to show that x_0^* extends y_0^* to E. But that is true, because for $y \in F$ it follows from (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} y_0^*(y) &\leq \Phi((x^*(y))_{x^* \in \Lambda}) \\ &= x_0^*(y). \end{aligned}$$

□

In the next section we will establish an optimal version of the König supremum theorem in terms of the following weak notion of convexity, useful in minimax theory as mentioned in the Introduction:

Definition 2.4 Let X and Λ be nonempty sets and for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ let $f_\lambda : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function. The family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is said to be *infsup-convex* on X provided that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} m \geq 1,\ \mathbf{t} \in \Delta_m \\ x_1, \ldots, x_m \in X \end{array}\right\} \ \Rightarrow\ \inf_{x\in X} \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x) \leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j f_\lambda(x_j).$$

Infsup-convexity not only properly extends the notion of convexity of a family functions, but also that of convexlikeness for a family of functions, due to K. Fan ([4, p. 42]).

3 A Generalized Version of König's Supremum Theorem

Now we focus on stating a general König supremum theorem, by replacing the vector space with a set, and the linear functional and the family of sublinear functionals with a suitable infsup-convex family of functions, so no linear structure is required. Furthermore, we prove that such a result is sharp.

Theorem 3.1 *Let X and Λ be nonempty sets, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a family of real valued functions defined on X such that the family $(f_\lambda - f)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is infsup-convex on X. Assume in addition that*

$$x \in X \ \Rightarrow\ (f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$$

and

$$x \in X \ \Rightarrow\ f(x) \leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x).$$

Then there exists $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ such that

$$x \in X \ \Rightarrow\ f(x) \leq \Phi((f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}).$$

Proof. Apply the Mazur–Orlicz theorem, Theorem 2.1, to the real vector space $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)$, its nonempty convex subset

$$C := \operatorname{conv}\{(f_\lambda(x) - f(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} :\ x \in X\},$$

and the sublinear functional $S : \ell^\infty(\Lambda) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given for each $\varphi \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ by

$$S(\varphi) := \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \varphi(\lambda).$$

Then, there exists $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ such that

$$\inf_{\varphi\in C} \Phi(\varphi) = \inf_{\varphi\in C} S(\varphi).$$

To conclude, let us observe, on the one hand, that

$$\inf_{\varphi\in C} \Phi(\varphi) = \inf_{x\in X} \Phi((f_\lambda(x) - f(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}),$$

and on the other hand, that the infsup-convexity of the family $(f_\lambda - f)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ on X and the assumption $f \leq S((f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda})$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\varphi\in C} S(\varphi) &= \inf_{\substack{m\geq 1, \mathbf{t}\in\Delta_m \\ x_1,\ldots,x_m\in X}} \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j(f_\lambda(x_j) - f(x_j)) \\ &\geq \inf_{x\in X} \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} (f_\lambda(x) - f(x)) \\ &\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for some $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$,

$$0 \leq \inf_{x\in X} \Phi((f_\lambda(x) - f(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}),$$

and taking into account that Φ is linear and $\Phi(\mathbf{1}) = 1$, because $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$, then

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x) \leq \Phi((f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}),$$

as announced. □

The equivalence of Theorem 3.1 and the Hahn–Banach theorem follows from that of the Hahn–Banach theorem and the Mazur–Orlicz theorem and from Proposition 2.3.

Since infsup-convexity is a concept invariant by adding a constant, then Theorem 3.1 can be equivalently reformulated as follows: assume that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, X and Λ are nonempty sets, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function, and that $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a family of real valued functions defined on X such that the family $(f_\lambda - f)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is infsup-convex on X and for all $x \in X$, $(f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$. If in addition

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x) + \alpha \leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x),$$

then, there exists $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ such that

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x) + \alpha \leq \Phi((f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}).$$

Surprisingly, the converse is also true, as we state in the following result, which is the above-mentioned optimality of Theorem 3.1:

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose that X and Λ are nonempty sets, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function, and that $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a family of real valued functions defined on X such that, for each $x \in X$, $(f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$. Then, the family $(f_\lambda - f)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is infsup-convex on X if, and only if, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying*

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x) + \alpha \leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x),$$

there exists $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$ such that

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x) + \alpha \leq \Phi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}).$$

Proof. According to the preceding argument, we focus on proving the sufficiency. Hence, let $m \geq 1$, $\mathbf{t} \in \Delta_m$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in X$. Let $\alpha := \inf_{x\in X} \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}(f_\lambda(x) - f(x))$, which can be assumed finite without any loss of generality. According to our assumption, we arrive at

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x) + \alpha \leq \Phi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda})$$

for some $\Phi \in \Delta_\Lambda$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &\leq \inf_{x\in X} \Phi((f_\lambda(x) - f(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) \qquad (\text{since } \Phi(\mathbf{1}) = 1)\\
&\leq \min_{j=1,\ldots,m} \Phi((f_\lambda(x_j) - f(x_j))_{\lambda\in\Lambda})\\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j \Phi((f_\lambda(x_j) - f(x_j))_{\lambda\in\Lambda})\\
&= \Phi\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j (f_\lambda(x_j) - f(x_j))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\right)\\
&\leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j (f_\lambda(x_j) - f(x_j)) \qquad (\text{because } \Phi \leq \sup_\Lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

The arbitrariness of $m \geq 1$, $\mathbf{t} \in \Delta_m$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in X$ yields the announced infsup-convexity. □

Let us point out that Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 were proven for Λ finite in [21, Theorem 2.3] and [21, Theorem 2.4], respectively.

4 Consequences in Infinite Programming

Assume that X and Λ are nonempty sets, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a family of real valued functions on X satisfying

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; (f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda),$$

and that the set

$$X_0 := \left\{ x \in X : \; \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x) \leq 0 \right\}$$

is nonempty. Let us consider the nonlinear infinite program

$$\inf_{x\in X_0} f(x). \tag{4.2}$$

If we denote by $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ the cone of the positive functionals in $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*$, then the associated *Lagrangian* $\mathbf{L} : X \times \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined at each $(x, \Phi) \in X \times \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ as

$$\mathbf{L}(x, \Phi) := f(x) + \Phi\left((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\right).$$

In addition, $(x^0, \Phi_0) \in X \times \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ is said to be a *saddle point* of $\mathbf{L}$ provided that

$$(x, \Phi) \in X \times \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+ \;\Rightarrow\; \mathbf{L}(x^0, \Phi) \leq \mathbf{L}(x^0, \Phi^0) \leq \mathbf{L}(x, \Phi^0).$$

In such a case, Φ_0 is a *Lagrange multiplier* for $\mathbf{L}$. It is an elementary fact that $x^0 \in X$ is an optimal solution of the nonlinear problem (4.2) provided there exists $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ such that (x^0, Φ_0) is a saddle point for the Lagrangian. Now we go the other way, by proving that the infsup-convexity of a certain family of functions is exactly the assumption required for –under a natural Slater condition– the existence of an optimal solution x^0 of (4.2) forces that of a Lagrange multiplier $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$. It is a Lagrange multiplier type result: see the classical theorem [33, 23] and its extensions in convexlike and quasiconvex contexts [1, 9, 10, 32, 5].

Before it, an easy technical result:

Lemma 4.1 *Let X and Λ be nonempty sets, $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a family of real valued functions defined on X such that*

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; (f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda),$$

and suppose that the set $X_0 := \{x \in X : \; \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x) \leq 0\}$ is nonempty. If $x^0 \in X$ is a solution of the nonlinear program (4.2), then

$$\inf_{x\in X} \max\left\{ \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\} = 0.$$

PROOF. We are assuming that

$$f(x^0) = \inf_{x \in X_0} f(x),$$

hence

$$0 \leq \inf_{x \in X_0} \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\}.$$

But for all $x \in X \backslash X_0$ there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda$ with $0 < f_\lambda(x)$, so

$$0 \leq \inf_{x \in X \backslash X_0} \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\}.$$

According to these two previous inequalities, we arrive at

$$0 \leq \inf_{x \in X} \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\}$$

and, since

$$0 = \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x^0), f(x^0) - f(x^0) \right\},$$

we have concluded the proof. □

Now we are in a position to state the aforementioned relationship between optimal solutions and saddle points (or Lagrange multipliers). This is our main statement on nonlinear infinite programming.

Theorem 4.2 *Suppose that X and Λ are nonempty sets, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and that $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a family of real valued functions defined on X such that*

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; (f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda),$$

and the feasible set $X_0 := \{x \in X : \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x) \leq 0\}$ is nonempty. Let us also assume that $x^0 \in X$ is an optimal solution of the nonlinear problem (4.2) and that the following Slater condition is fulfilled:

$$\text{there exists } x^1 \in X \text{ such that } \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x^1) < 0.$$

Then there exists $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ such that (x^0, Φ_0) is a saddle point for $\mathbf{L}$ if, and only if, the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$ is infsup-convex on X.

PROOF. We first assume that for some $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$, (x^0, Φ_0) is a saddle point of $\mathbf{L}$. Then $f(x^0) = \mathbf{L}(x^0, \Phi_0)$ and

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; \mathbf{L}(x^0, \Phi_0) \leq \mathbf{L}(x, \Phi_0),$$

i.e.,

$$0 \leq \inf_{x \in X} (\Phi_0((f_\lambda(x)))_{\lambda \in \Lambda} + f(x) - f(x^0)). \tag{4.3}$$

Let $\Lambda_0 := \Lambda \cup \{\mu\}$, where $\mu \notin \Lambda$, and define $\Psi \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda_0)^* = \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^* \times \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\Psi := \frac{1}{1 + \Phi_0(\mathbf{1})}(\Phi_0, 1),$$

which clearly belongs to Δ_{Λ_0} and, thanks to (4.3) satisfies

$$0 \leq \inf_{x \in X} \Psi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))).$$

But, since x^0 is an optimal solution for (4.2), in view of Lemma 4.1,

$$0 = \inf_{x \in X} \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\}.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\inf_{x \in X} \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\} \leq \inf_{x \in X} \Psi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0)))$$

and this inequality and the fact that $\Psi \in \Delta_{\Lambda_0}$ easily imply the infsup-convexity of the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$ on X.

And conversely, let us suppose that $x^0 \in X$ is an optimal solution of the nonlinear program under consideration and that the Slater condition is satisfied. The first assumption and Lemma 4.1 yield

$$\inf_{x \in X} \max \left\{ \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0) \right\} = 0.$$

Then, Theorem 3.1, when applied with the function $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, assigning to each $x \in X$ the value

$$f(x) := 0,$$

and the infsup-convexity on X of the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$, provides us with a positive and linear functional $\Phi : \Lambda \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\rho \geq 0$ with

$$\Phi(\mathbf{1}) + \rho = 1$$

and

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; 0 \leq \Phi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) + \rho(f(x) - f(x^0)). \tag{4.4}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;&\leq \inf_{x\in X} \Phi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) + \rho(f(x) - f(x^0)) \\ &\leq \Phi((f_\lambda(x^1))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) + \rho(f(x^1) - f(x^0)) \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x^1) + \rho(f(x^1) - f(x^0)) \\ &< \rho(f(x^1) - f(x^0)), \end{aligned}$$

and then $\rho \neq 0$. If we take $\Phi_0 := \Phi/\rho \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$, then, according to (4.4) we arrive at

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; f(x^0) \leq f(x) + \Phi_0((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}).$$

Taking $x = x^0$ in this inequality, we deduce that

$$0 \leq \Phi_0((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}),$$

while the fact that x^0 is an optimal solution and $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ implies

$$\Phi_0((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) \leq 0,$$

and then

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; \mathbf{L}(x^0, \Phi_0) \leq \mathbf{L}(x, \Phi_0).$$

Finally, given $\Upsilon \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ it follows that

$$\Upsilon((g_\lambda(x^0)_{\lambda\in\Lambda})) \leq 0,$$

so

$$\mathbf{L}(x^0, \Upsilon) \leq \mathbf{L}(x^0, \Phi_0)$$

and we have completed the proof. □

We would hope that the Slater condition in Theorem 4.2 could be replaced with this weaker one:

$$\text{there exists } x^1 \in X \text{ such that } \lambda \in \Lambda \;\Rightarrow\; f_\lambda(x^1) < 0, \tag{4.5}$$

but it is false in general:

Example 4.3 Let $X := \mathbb{R}$, $\Lambda := \mathbb{N}$, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function assigning to each $x \in X$

$$f(x) := x,$$

and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_n : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined at each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_n(x) = -\frac{x^3}{n}.$$

Then, the feasible set is

$$X_0 = \mathbb{R}_+.$$

The Slater condition fails, for if there exists $x^1 \in \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} f_n(x^1) < 0,$$

then, in particular, $x^1 \in X_0 = \mathbb{R}_+$, but for such an x^1,

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} f_n(x^1) = 0,$$

which contradicts the Slater condition. However, clearly any $x^1 \in X_0\backslash\{0\}$ fulfils (4.5). To conclude, let us show that, despite the fact that the nonlinear program

$$\inf_{x\in X_0} f(x)$$

admits the optimal solution $x^0 = 0$, there exists no a corresponding Lagrange multiplier $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})^*_+$ for the associated Lagrangian $\mathbf{L}$. To this end, in order to check the hypotheses in Theorem 4.2 (obviously except the Slater condition), we prove the unique non trivial fact that the family $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \cup f$ is infsup-convex on $\mathbb{R}$ ($f(x^0) = 0$), that is,

$$\inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \left(\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} f_n(x) \vee f(x) \right) \leq \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sum_{j=1}^m t_j f_n(x_j) \vee \sum_{j=1}^m t_j f(x_j),$$

whenever $m \geq 1$, $\mathbf{t} \in \Delta_m$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_m \in \mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 4.1 we know for the left-hand side that

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_n(x) \vee f(x) \right) = 0,$$

so we have to show that

$$0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j f_n(x_j) \vee \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j f(x_j),$$

i.e.,

$$0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j x_j^3 \right) \left(-\frac{1}{n} \right) \vee \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j x_j \right).$$

But this inequality is clearly satisfied, because if

$$0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j x_j^3$$

then

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j x_j^3 \right) \left(-\frac{1}{n} \right) = 0$$

and the inequality holds, while if

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j x_j^3 < 0$$

then

$$0 \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j x_j^3 \right) \left(-\frac{1}{n} \right),$$

which implies the validity of the inequality and thus the above mentioned infsup-convexity.

We finish by arguing by contradiction, so let us assume that the nonlinear problem under consideration admits a Lagrange multiplier $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})^*_+$. Since, in particular, $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})^*$, making use of the Dixmier decomposition of $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})^*$, there exist $y_0 \in \ell^1(\mathbb{N})$ and $\varphi_0 \in c_0(\mathbb{N})^\perp$ such that

$$\Phi_0 = y_0 + \varphi_0,$$

where $c_0(\mathbb{N})$ is the closed linear subspace of $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})$ of those null sequences and $c_0(\mathbb{N})^\perp$ is its annihilator. Observe that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $y_0(n) \geq 0$, because $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})^*_+$ and $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, \overbrace{1}^{n)}, 0, \dots, 0, \dots) \in \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})_+$, so

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \Phi_0(e_n) \\ &= y_0(e_n) + \varphi_0(e_n) \\ &= y_0(n) \qquad (\varphi_0 \in c_0(\mathbb{N})^\perp,\ e_n \in c_0(\mathbb{N})). \end{aligned}$$

Then, taking into account that we are assuming that $(0, \Phi_0)$ is a saddle point for the Lagrangian, in particular there holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f(x^0) + \Phi_0((f_n(x^0))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}) \leq f(x) + \Phi_0((f_n(x))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}).$$

But $(f_n(x^0))_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in c_0(\mathbb{N})$, so this inequality is nothing more than

$$x \in \mathbb{R} \ \Rightarrow\ 0 \leq x - x^3 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_0(n)}{n} \tag{4.6}$$

which is absurd, because if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_0(n)}{n} = 0$, then it suffices to take $x < 0$ in (4.6) to arrive at a contradiction, while if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_0(n)}{n} > 0$, a large enough $x > 0$ yields

$$x - x^3 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{y_0(n)}{n} < 0,$$

once again against the inequality (4.6). □

We finish by deriving from Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 3.1 some Karush–Kuhn–Tucker and Fritz John results (see [13, 12, 18, 2, 11, 6]), respectively, for which the sharp concept of convexity turns out to be once again infsup-convexity. The first of them is just an equivalent reformulation of Theorem 4.2, according to the easy-to-prove fact that the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions below are equivalent to the existence of a Lagrange multiplier:

Theorem 4.4 *Assume that X and Λ are nonempty sets, $x^0 \in X$, $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and that $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ is a family of real valued functions defined on X in such a way that the feasible set $X_0 := \{x \in X :\ \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x) \leq 0\}$ is nonempty and that*

$$x \in X \ \Rightarrow\ (f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda).$$

If in addition the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$ is infsup-convex on X and the Slater condition

there exists $x^1 \in X$ such that $\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x^1) < 0$

is valid, then x^0 *is an optimal solution for the nonlinear problem* (4.2) *if, and only if,* $x^0 \in X_0$ *and there exists* $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ *such that*

$$f + \Phi_0((f_\lambda(\cdot))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) \text{ attains its infimum on } X \text{ at } x^0$$

and

$$\Phi_0((f_\lambda(x^0))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) = 0.$$

The Fritz John result needs some additional work:

Theorem 4.5 *Let* X *and* Λ *be nonempty sets,* $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *and for all* $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f_\lambda : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *such that the feasible set* $X_0 := \{x \in X : \sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x) \leq 0\}$ *is nonempty,* x^0 *is an optimal solution of the infinite program* (4.2)*, and*

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; (f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda).$$

Then, there exist $\rho \geq 0$ *and* $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ *with* $\rho + \Phi_0(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ *satisfying the following Fritz John conditions*

$$\rho f + \Phi_0((f_\lambda(\cdot))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) \text{ attains its infimum on } X \text{ at } x^0 \tag{4.7}$$

and

$$\Phi_0((f_\lambda(x^0))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}) = 0 \tag{4.8}$$

if, and only if, the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$ *is infsup-convex on* X*.*

Proof. Suppose that the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$ is infsup-convex on X. Apply Lemma 4.1 to arrive at

$$\inf_{x\in X} \max\left\{\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0)\right\} = 0.$$

Then, Theorem 3.1 provides us with a $\Phi \in \Delta_{\Lambda_0}$ (same notation as in the proof of Theorem 4.2) such that

$$0 \leq \Phi((f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))),$$

i.e., for some $\rho \geq 0$ and $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ we have that

$$\Phi_0(\mathbf{1}) \geq 0,$$

$$\Phi_0(\mathbf{1}) + \rho = 1$$

and

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; \rho f(x^0) \leq \rho f(x) + \Phi_0((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}). \tag{4.9}$$

Condition (4.8) follows from both the fact that $x^0 \in X_0$ and $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$, and inequality (4.9) for $x = x^0$. And conditions (4.8) and (4.9) clearly imply (4.7).

And conversely, if $\rho \geq 0$ and $\Phi_0 \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)^*_+$ with $\rho + \Phi_0(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ fulfil conditions (4.7) and (4.8), then

$$x \in X \;\Rightarrow\; 0 \leq \rho(f(x) - f(x^0)) + \Phi_0((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda}).$$

In particular, $\Psi := (\Phi_0, \rho) \in \Delta_{\Lambda_0}$ (notation in the proof of Theorem 4.2) satisfies, according to Lemma 4.1, that

$$\inf_{x\in X} \max\left\{\sup_{\lambda\in\Lambda} f_\lambda(x), f(x) - f(x^0)\right\} \leq \inf_{x\in X} \Psi((f_\lambda(x))_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))),$$

which, as mentioned in the proof of Theorem 4.2, implies the infsup-convexity of the family $(f_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cup (f - f(x^0))$ on X. □

Acknowledgement

The research of the first author has been partially supported by Centro de EStudios Superiores La Inmaculada (University of Granada) and that of the second one by Junta de Andalucía Grant FQM359.

References

1. K.J. Arrow, A.C. Enthoven, *Quasi-concave programming*, Econometrica **29** (1961), 779–800.
2. O. Brezhnevaa, A.A. Tret'yakov, *An elementary proof of the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker theorem in normed linear spaces for problems with a finite number of inequality constraints*, Optimization **60** (2011), 613–618.
3. N. Dinh, T.H. Mo, *Generalizations of the Hahn–Banach theorem revisited*, Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics **19** (2015), 1285–1304.
4. K. Fan, *Minimax theorems*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **39** (1953), 42–47.
5. D. Fang, X. Luo, X. Wang, *Strong and total Lagrange dualities for quasiconvex programming*, Journal of Applied Mathematics **2014** (2014), Article ID 453912.
6. F. Flores-Bazán, *Fritz John necessary optimality conditions of the alternative-type*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **161** (2014), 807–818.

7. A.I. Garralda-Guillem, M. Ruiz Galán, *Mixed variational formulations in locally convex spaces*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **414** (2014), 825–849.
8. J. Grzybowski, H. Przybycień, R. Urbański, *On Simons' version of Hahn–Banach–Lagrange theorem*, Function Spaces X, 99–104, Banach Center Publications **102**, Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Mathematics, Warsaw, 2014.
9. M. Hayasi, H. Komiya, *Perfect duality for convexlike programs*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **38** (1982), 179–189.
10. T. Illés, G. Kassay, *Theorems of the alternative and optimality conditions for convexlike and general convexlike programming*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **101** (1999), 243–257.
11. K. Ito, K. Kunisch, *Karush–Kuhn–Tucker conditions for nonsmooth mathematical programming problems in function spaces*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization **49** (2011), 2133–2154.
12. F. John, *Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions*, Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday, 1948, 187–204. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, 1948.
13. W. Karush, *Minima of functions of several variables with inequalities as side conditions*, MSc Thesis, Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, 1939.
14. G. Kassay, J. Kolumbán, *On a generalized sup-inf problem*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications **91** (1996), 651–670.
15. H. König, *Sublinear functionals and conical measures*, Archiv der Mathematik **77** (2001), 56–64.
16. H. König, *Sublineare funktionale*, Archiv der Mathematik **23** (1972), 500–508.
17. H. König, *Über das von Neumannsche minimax-theorem*, Archiv der Mathematik **19** (1968), 482–487.
18. H.W. Kuhn, A.W. Tucker, *Nonlinear programming*, Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1950, pp. 481–492. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951.
19. F.-C. Liu, *Mazur–Orlicz equality*, Studia Mathematica **189** (2008), 53–63.
20. S. Mazur, W. Orlicz, *Sur les espaces métriques linéaires II*, Studia Mathematica **13** (1953), 137–179.
21. P. Montiel López, M. Ruiz Galán, *Nonlinear programming via König's maximum theorem*, Journal of Optmization Theory and Applications **170** (2016), 838–852.
22. V. Pták, *On a theorem of Mazur and Orlicz*, Studia Mathematica **15** (1956), 365–366.
23. R.T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*. Reprint of the 1970 original, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997.
24. M. Ruiz Galán, *A sharp Lagrange multiplier theorem for nonlinear programming*, Journal of Global Optimization **65** (2016), 513–530.
25. M. Ruiz Galán, *The Gordan theorem and its implications for minimax theory*, to appear in Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis.
26. M. Ruiz Galán, *An intrinsic notion of convexity for minimax*, Journal of Convex Analysis **21** (2014), 1105–1139.
27. S. Simons, *Bootstrapping the Mazur–Orlicz–König theorem*, preprint.
28. S. Simons, *The Hahn–Banach–Lagrange theorem*, Optimization **56** (2007), 149–169.
29. S. Simons, *Minimal sublinear functionals*, Studia Mathematica **37** (1970), 37–56.
30. A. Stefanescu, *A theorem of the alternative and a two-function minimax theorem*, Journal of Applied Mathematics **2004:2** (2004), 167–177.
31. C. Sun, *The Mazur–Orlicz theorem for convex functionals*, to appear in Journal of Convex Analysis.
32. S. Suzuki, D. Kuroiwa, *Optimality conditions and the basic constraint qualification for quasiconvex programming*, Nonlinear Analysis **74** (2011), 1279–1285.
33. H. Uzawa, *The Kuhn–Tucker theorem in concave programming*. In: K.J. Arrow, L. Hurwicz, H. Uzawa (Eds.), *Studies in linear and nonlinear programming*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp.: 32–37, 1958.